

## Socio-economic determinants of tourism trips by Jambi residents

**Hardiani; Amril**

Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Jambi

*e-mail: dian\_nst@yahoo.com*

### **Abstrak**

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis: 1) karakteristik perjalanan penduduk di Provinsi Jambi baik untuk tujuan wisata maupun tujuan lainnya; 2) karakteristik penduduk yang melakukan perjalanan wisata di Provinsi Jambi; 3) Faktor-faktor sosial ekonomi yang mempengaruhi perjalanan wisata penduduk di Provinsi Jambi. Data bersumber dari “raw data” SUSENAS Tahun 2015 Provinsi Jambi. Untuk menganalisis karakteristik perjalanan penduduk, dan karakteristik individu wisatawan dilakukan secara deskriptif. Untuk menganalisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi perjalanan wisata penduduk digunakan model regresi binary logistik. Hasil penelitian menemukan: 1). Aktivitas perjalanan penduduk di Provinsi Jambi masih relatif rendah. Hanya 14,14 persen dari total penduduk yang pernah melakukan perjalanan dalam enam bulan terakhir; 2) Selain rendahnya aktivitas perjalanan tersebut, aktivitas perjalanan untuk wisata juga masih relatif terbatas. Hanya 17,79 persen total penduduk yang melakukan perjalanan untuk berwisata; 3) Objek tujuan wisata penduduk Provinsi Jambi didominasi objek wisata yang ada di Provinsi Jambi sendiri, selain objek wisata yang ada di provinsi-provinsi berdekatan yaitu Sumatera Selatan, Sumatera Barat dan Bengkulu; 4). Perjalanan wisata penduduk didominasi oleh perjalanan wisata keluarga, sehingga relatif didominasi oleh anak-anak dan orang tua; 5) Faktor-faktor sosial ekonomi yang berpengaruh nyata terhadap perjalanan wisata penduduk adalah umur, pendidikan dan status dalam keluarga. Selain itu, terdapat perbedaan probabilitas perjalanan penduduk untuk wisata antara kabupaten/kota di Provinsi Jambi.

---

*Kata Kunci: objek wisata, wisata keluarga, perjalanan wisata*

### **Abstract**

This study aims to analyze: 1) characteristics of trips generated by Jambi residents both for tourism purposes or other purposes; 2) characteristics of Jambi residents going on a tourism trip; 3) Socio-economic factors affecting tourism trips generated by Jambi residents. Data was taken from raw data provided in the result of Indonesian National Social Economic Survey (SUSENAS) for Jambi Province 2015. Descriptive research method was used to analyze the characteristics of trips by Jambi residents and of the tourists. Binary logistic regression model was used to analyze factors affecting tourism trips generated by residents. The study found: 1) Number of trips generated by Jambi residents are still relatively low. Only 14.4 percent of the total population has traveled within the last six months; 2) Besides the low number of trips, tourism activities are still relatively limited. Only 17.79 percent of population go on a tourism trip; 3) Tourist attractions in Jambi Province itself are the most common tourism destinations for Jambi residents, then followed by tourist attractions in South Sumatra, West Sumatra and Bengkulu; 4) Tourism trips generated by residents are mostly family trips, so they are relatively dominated by children and parents; 5) Socio-economic factors that significantly influence residents to go on a tourism trip are age,

education, and family status. In addition, there is a probability difference of tourism trips by residents of the city and of the regency in Jambi Province.

---

*Key words: tourism attraction, family trip, tourism trip*

---

## INTRODUCTION

Tourism is one of the sectors that the government relies on to gain foreign exchange from non-oil revenues. Tourism is not only as the source of foreign exchange earnings. It also contributes much to other sectors/areas. It is creating more jobs, expanding economic opportunity, increasing total income in society and government revenue, encouraging the preservation of the environment and national culture, strengthening the unity of the nation, and so forth.

There are various theories to explain tourism from experts in this field. Gamal (1997) explained that tourism is a process of temporary departure of someone to another place other than his/her place of residence. There are various interests that could be travel motivations. Those interests are economic interest, social interest, cultural interest, political interest, religious interest, health/medical interest, and other interest. Freuler on Irawan (2010) defined tourism as a phenomenon unique to modern time which is dependent on the people's increasing need for a change and relaxing, the wish of recognizing the beauties of nature and art and the belief that nature gives happiness to human beings and which helps nations and communities' approaching to each other thanks to the developments in commerce and industry and the communication and transportation tools' becoming excellent.

In tourism terminology, a person who is travelling or going on a tourism trip is called tourist and tourist's destination is called tourist attraction or tourism object. According to Fandeli (1995), tourist attractions can be divided into 3 categories by its attractiveness: natural attraction, cultural attraction, and special interest attraction.

Several types of tourism that are already known are cultural tourism, health tourism, sports tourism, commercial tourism, industrial tourism, marine tourism, nature tourism, and honeymoon (Pendit, 1994). Furthermore, Cohen (1972) classifies tourists based on the place to be visited as well as the level of organization of their trip. Cohen classifies tourists into four types: 1) Drifter, tourists who want to visit unfamiliar places (has never been known) and travel in a small group of tourists; 2) Explorer, tourists who plan trips on their own and go somewhere unusual (don't want to visit common places for tourists). This type of tourists are willing to take advantage of local-standards facilities and seek more to interact with local community; 3) Individual Mass Tourist, tourists who rely on their travel agency to arrange their journey and they visit famous tourist destinations; 4) Organized Mass Tourist, tourists who only want to visit tourist destinations that have been known by them, with similar facilities to their home country, and their journey is always guided by the tour guide.

There are a lot of factors that motivate people to go on tourism travel. According to Yoon & Uysal (2005), most push factors are intrinsic motivators, such as the desire for escape, rest and relaxation, prestige, health and fitness, adventure, and social interaction. Meanwhile pull factors are related to extrinsic aspects i.e. situational or cognitive factors. Meanwhile the pull factor emerge due to the attractiveness of a destination as perceived by tourists e.g. beaches, recreational facilities and historical places, tourist perceptions and expectations to something new, the expected benefits, as well as the image of the tourist attraction.

Foster (1985) suggests the main factors affecting tourism travel are as follows: 1) Tourist profile; 2) Travel awareness that includes information about the tourist destination as well as the availability of facilities and services; 3) Trip features which covers a distance of time lived in the area, objectives, cost, and travel time; 4) Resources and last of destination, which includes the types of attractions, accommodation, availability and quality of service, facility, environmental conditions etc.

Studies related to factors affecting tourism trips have been done a lot. They found several socio-economic factors such as income, education, the number of family members, travel costs, mileage, attractiveness and free time/leisure (Ernita, 2001; Agustin, Sentosa and Aimon, 2014; Mulyani, 2006).

Jambi Province is one of the regions in Indonesia that has a diverse tourism potential. In this province, there are potential natural, cultural, and historical tourism to be developed. Geographically, Jambi Province is also located in a strategic area as it is adjacent to Singapore-Johor-Riau (SIJORI) Growth Triangle. Moreover, the tourism development is also supported by adequate supporting infrastructure.

However, in order to develop this tourism potential into tourism industry that is capable of supporting regional development, the local government and tourism stakeholders need to understand various aspects including characteristics of tourists and factors affecting tourism trips by residents. It is aimed to create tourism strategy (choosing the product, determining the price and the distribution as well the way to promote tourist objects / tourist attractions) that could be more effective to attract tourists to go on trips to tourist attractions in Jambi Province.

Based on the explanation above, this study specifically aims to analyze: 1) characteristics of trips by Jambi residents both for tourism purposes or other purposes; 2) characteristics of Jambi residents who go on a tourism trip; 3) Socio-economic factors affecting tourism trips generated by Jambi residents.

## METHOD

This study used raw data from SUSENAS 2015 for all regencies/cities in Jambi Province. Descriptive analysis was used to analyze the characteristics of trips generated by residents through processing of raw data SUSENAS for Jambi Province 2015. Tourism trips generated by residents can be divided based on the main purposes of going on trip such as for holiday/leisure/recreation, professional/business, meeting/congress/seminar, education/training, visiting friends/relatives and sports/arts. These characteristics are analyzed based on differences between regency-city and rural-urban.

Binary logistic regression model was used to analyze factors affecting tourism trips generated by residents. The use of binary logit regression model is due to dependent variables consisting of two categories. Those categories are “have traveled within the last 6 months” and “haven’t traveled within the last 6 months”. Meanwhile the independent variables are socioeconomic characteristics of individuals and households.

The binary logistic regression model is given as follows:

$$g(x_{ki}) = S_0 + S_{1,D1}X_{1,D1} + S_{1,D2}X_{1,D2} + S_{1,D3}X_{1,D3} + S_{1,D4}X_{1,D4} + S_2X_2 \\ + S_{3,D1}X_{3,D1} + S_{3,D2}X_{3,D2} + S_{3,D3}X_{3,D3} + S_4X_4 + S_{5,D1}X_{5,D1} + S_{5,D2}X_{5,D2} \\ + S_{5,D3}X_{5,D3} + S_{6,D1}X_{6,D1} + S_{6,D2}X_{6,D2} + S_{6,D3}X_{6,D3} + S_{6,D4}X_{6,D4} + S_{6,D5}X_{6,D5} \\ + S_{6,D6}X_{6,D6} + S_{6,D7}X_{6,D7} + S_{6,D8}X_{6,D8} + S_{6,D9}X_{6,D9} + S_{6,D10}X_{6,D10} + S_7X_7 + e$$

where:

$g(x_{ki})$  = probability of going on a tourism trip within the last 6 months

(0 = haven't traveled; 1=have traveled)

$X_1$  = Age group

$X_{1.D1}$  1 = 10 - 19; 0 = other

$X_{1.D3}$  1 = 30 - 39; 0 = other

$X_{1.D2}$  1 = 20 - 29; 0 = other

$X_{1.D4}$  1 = 40+; 0 = other

$X_2$  = Sex (1 = male; 0 = female)

$X_3$  = Educational attainment

$X_{3.D1}$  1 = Primary school; 0 = other

$X_{3.D2}$  1 = Junior high school; 0 = other

$X_{3.D3}$  1 = Senior high school; 0 = other

$X_4$  = Marital status (1 = married; 0 = other)

$X_5$  = Family status

$X_{5.D1}$  1 = Wife / Husband; 0 = other

$X_{5.D2}$  1 = Child; 0 = other

$X_{5.D3}$  1 = Other household members; 0 = other

$X_6$  = Regency/city

$X_{6.D1}$  1 = Kerinci; 0 = other

$X_{6.D3}$  1 = Sarolangun; 0 = other

$X_{6.D5}$  1 = Muaro Jambi; 0 = other

$X_{6.D7}$  1 = Tanjabbar; 0 = other

$X_{6.D9}$  1 = Bungo; 0 = other

$X_{6.D2}$  1 = Merangin; 0 = other

$X_{6.D4}$  1 = Batang Hari; 0 = other

$X_{6.D6}$  1 = Tanjabtim; 0 = other

$X_{6.D8}$  1 = Tebo; 0 = other

$X_{6.D10}$  1 = Sungai Penuh; 0 = other

$X_7$  = Rural/Urban (1 = Rural; 0 = Urban)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Frequency of trips generated by Jambi residents

The pattern of trips generated by residents in this study was analyzed from the results of National Socioeconomic Survey (SUSENAS) for Jambi Province 2015. The sample consisted of 5,989 households (22,461 individuals/household members). One of the questions in the survey is the information about tourism trips (travelling to commercial attractions, or staying in commercial accommodation, or going on round trip  $\geq 100$  km) generated by residents within the last six months, and not a trip to school or for working on a regular basis.

Based on these considerations, it can generally be argued that the frequency of trips generated by Jambi residents is still relatively low. Only 1,910 households or 31.89 percent (of the total number of households) have members who have traveled within the last six months. This proportion is even smaller when it is compared to individuals who have traveled within the last six months (3,177 household members/individuals or 14.14 percent of the total household members).

Based on regency/city as the factor, the proportion is relatively variable. At the individual level, Sungai Penuh city became the region with the largest proportion of individuals going on a tourism trip (19.25 percent). In contrast, Kerinci regency had the smallest proportion of individuals going on a tourism trip (only 9.17 percent). Furthermore, at household level, Batanghari regency became the region with the largest proportion of traveling. In this region, nearly half (14.82 percent) of the total households have traveled within the last six months. On the contrary, the region with the smallest proportion in this case was Kerinci regency (only 13.76 percent).

**Table 1 Proportion of individuals and households that have traveled within the last 6 months based on regency/city in Jambi Province in 2015**

Regency/City	% Individual	% Household
Kerinci	9,17	13,76
Merangin	16,17	37,45
Sarolangun	12,55	28,49
Batang Hari	18,49	41,82
Muaro Jambi	10,55	27,14
Tanjab Barat	14,05	32,73
Tanjab Timur	13,55	27,90
Tebo	12,80	31,54
Bungo	15,28	35,00
Jambi City	14,54	36,93
Sungai Penuh	19,25	39,21
<b>Jambi Province</b>	<b>14,14</b>	<b>31,89</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas2015*

Based on urban-rural, it is shown that residents in urban areas have tendency to travel or go on a trip more than those in rural areas. At the individual level, 18.57 percent (of the total population) that have traveled within the last six months are living in urban areas, while only 12.38 percent living in rural areas. At the household level, 44.76 percent (of the total households) that have traveled within the last six months are urban households, while only 27.07 percent are in rural areas.

**Table 2 Proportion of individuals and households that have traveled within the last 6 months based on urban-rural in Jambi Province in 2015**

Area	% Individual	% Household
Urban	18,57	44,76
Rural	12,38	27,07
<b>Jambi Province</b>	<b>14,14</b>	<b>31,89</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas2015*

### **Main purposes of trips by residents of Jambi Province**

There are some main purposes of trips generated that can be grouped for the purpose of leisure/recreation, professional/business, meeting/congress/seminar, education/training, visiting friends/relatives, medical/treatment, pilgrimages/religious, and sports/arts. Of the various purposes of the trips, there are four purposes with the largest proportion. Those are the trip with the purpose of visiting friends/relatives (60.25 percent), of leisure/recreation (17.79 percent), of medical/treatment (5.70 percent), and of business/professional (4.88 percent). Meanwhile five other types of tourism purposes (meeting/congress/seminar, education/training, pilgrimages/religious, as well sports/arts) have a relatively small proportion of each and the combined proportion of them is only 11.39 percent (Table 3).

The pattern of trips generated by residents at the provincial level is showing the same pattern as the one at urban-rural level. This can be seen from the fact that trips for the purpose of visiting friends/relatives and of leisure/recreation are dominant while the other purposes have a relatively small proportion. The proportion of people in urban areas going on a trip for visiting friends/relatives is 60.94 percent and for leisure/recreation is 20.03 percent. In rural areas, the proportions of people going on a

trip for visiting friends/relatives and for leisure/recreation are 59.83 percent and 16.44 percent, respectively (Table 4).

**Table 4 Proportion of individuals and households that have traveled within the last 6 months based on main intentions and regency/city in Jambi Province in 2015**

Regency/City	Leisure/ Recreation	Profession/ Business	Medical/ Treatment	Visiting Friends/ Relatives	Others	Total
Kerinci	13,84	5,03	8,81	51,57	20,75	100,00
Merangin	18,99	4,15	7,42	58,46	10,98	100,00
Sarolangun	6,59	8,91	9,69	58,91	15,89	100,00
Batang Hari	13,30	3,46	3,72	68,88	10,64	100,00
Muaro Jambi	46,52	1,30	2,61	43,48	6,09	100,00
Tanjab Barat	12,50	5,21	4,86	64,24	13,19	100,00
Tanjab Timur	13,16	3,76	6,77	58,65	17,67	100,00
Tebo	10,39	1,08	4,30	75,27	8,96	100,00
Bungo	10,00	3,94	5,45	72,42	8,18	100,00
Jambi City	30,27	4,32	1,62	58,38	5,41	100,00
Sungai Penuh	21,13	13,03	10,21	41,55	14,08	100,00
<b>Jambi Province</b>	<b>17,78</b>	<b>4,88</b>	<b>5,70</b>	<b>60,25</b>	<b>11,39</b>	<b>100,00</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas2015*

**Table 5 Proportion of individuals and households that have traveled within the last 6 months based on main intentions and urban-rural in Jambi Province in 2015**

Main Intentions	Urban	Rural	Total
Leisure/Recreation	20,03	16,44	17,78
Profession/Business	6,14	4,12	4,88
Medical/Treatment	5,13	6,03	5,70
Visiting Friends/Family	60,94	59,83	60,25
Others	7,74	13,57	11,39
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>100,00</b>	<b>100,00</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas2015*

### **Destination provinces for tourism trips by Jambi residents**

Trip or travel with the purpose for leisure/recreation in this case means that its purpose of traveling is to get pleasure or leisure like a visit to commercial attractions, hunting in the forest, visiting Borobudur temple, Lake Toba, etc.

Based on the main destination provinces for tourism trips by Jambi residents, it is seen that the largest share (65.49 percent) is within Jambi Province. Other than because of its cheaper travel costs, Jambi Province basically has comparatively attractive tourist objects for local tourists (Jambi residents).

Other provinces that become main destinations for tourism trips by Jambi residents are West Sumatra, South Sumatra, and Bengkulu. These three are regions directly adjacent to Jambi Province, making it more possible for Jambi residents to

travel on a relatively cheap cost. In addition, these provinces also have tourist attractions, mainly interesting natural attractions.

**Table 6 Jambi residents going on tourism trips based on their main destination province in 2015**

Main Destination Province	Frequency	%
Aceh	1	0,18
North Sumatra	9	1,59
West Sumatra	106	18,76
Riau	9	1,59
Jambi	370	65,49
South Sumatra	17	3,01
Bengkulu	17	3,01
Riau Islands	3	0,53
Jakarta	7	1,24
Jawa Barat	12	2,12
Jawa Tengah	2	0,35
Yogyakarta	2	0,35
Bali	10	1,77
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100,00</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas2015*

### Characteristics of Jambi residents going on tourism trips

#### *Age and sex*

Jambi residents going on tourism trips are generally young people ( $\leq 9$  years old and between 10 – 19 years old) and people aged 40 or above. From the total residents going on a tourism trip, 70.80 percent of them are those in three age groups. In contrast, residents at the peak productive age (20-39 years old) have a relatively small proportion of tourism trips.

**Table 7 Jambi residents going on tourism trips based on age in 2015**

Groups of age (in years old)	Frequency	%
$\leq 9$	133	23,54
10 - 19	130	23,01
20 -29	65	11,50
30 - 39	100	17,70
40+	137	24,25
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100,00</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas2015*

Furthermore, based on sex, there is almost no difference in the proportion between men and women. Of the total residents going on tourism trips, 50.80 percent are male and 49.20 percent are women. This fact shows that there is no preference for tourism trips generated by Jambi residents due to various tourist destinations that are not designed specifically for certain sex.

**Table 8 Jambi residents going on tourism trips based on sex in 2015**

<b>Sexes</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Male	287	50,80
Female	278	49,20
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100,00</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas2015*

### **Education**

Based on education, more than a third (34.87 percent) of residents going on trips are those who are highly educated (senior high school or above). The relatively high educational attainment is basically related to the increased tertiary needs in those with higher education (which also reflects higher incomes).

In the second place with a relatively large proportion are those who don't go to school/haven't graduated from primary school (32.57 percent). The large proportion of the residents going on tourism trips on this group is basically related to the number of children who travel together with their parents/family.

**Table 9 Jambi residents going on tourism trip based on educationin 2015**

<b>Education</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
No schooling / did not/not yet completed Primary School	184	32,57
Primary school	104	18,41
Junior high school	80	14,16
Senior high school	197	34,87
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100,00</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas2015*

### **Family status**

Children in family are individuals who dominate tourism trips generated by Jambi residents. More than half (51.05 percent) of total tourism trips generated by those who have status as children in their family. Furthermore, in a relatively balanced proportion, there are 22.48 percent of trips generated by head of household and 21.06 percent of trips generated by wives/husbands who aren't the head of household.

**Table 10 Jambi residents going to tourism trips based on family status in 2015**

<b>Family status</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>%</b>
Head of household	127	22,48
Wife/Husband	119	21,06
Biological/Step/Adopted children	289	51,05
Others	30	5,31
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100,00</b>

*Source: based on raw data of Susenas 2015*

### **Main activities**

Main activities of residents can be divided into work, school, housekeeping, other activities, and temporarily not working. Based on those categories, it can be argued that the largest proportion of the main activities of residents going on trips is work (29.17 percent), followed by other activities (27.73 percent) and housekeeping (24.84 percent).



**Table 11 Jambi residents going on tourism trips based on main activities in 2015**

Main activities	Frequency	%
Work	165	29,17
School	99	17,61
Housekeeping	140	24,84
Other activities	157	27,73
Temporarily not working	4	0,66
<b>Total</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100,00</b>

Source: based on raw data of Susenas 2015

### Socio-economic factors affecting tourism trips generated by Jambi residents

Overall Model Fit Test of the model is applied to Table 11. Based on Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients, obtained Chi\_Square statistic value of 311,509 with significance probability( $p$ ) = 0.000. Thus it can be concluded that the independent variables in the model together influence the decision and behavior of population/residents to go to tourism trips or not. Based on Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, it is obtained Chi-Square value of 8.863 with a  $p$  value of 0.354. Since Chi\_Square is not significant ( $p > 0.05$ ), it can be concluded that the predicted probability is matched to the observed probability. In other words, there is no difference between the model and the data so it can be said that the model is fit.

**Table 12 Overall model fit test for tourism trip model**

	Chi-square	df	Sig.
<i>Omnibus test of model coefficients</i>			
Step	311,509	23	.000
Block	311,509	23	.000
Model	311,509	23	.000
<i>Hosmer and Lemeshow Test</i>	8,863	8	.354

The overall prediction accuracy is 82,2 percent, while the prediction accuracy for not taking trips is 98,3 percent and for taking trips is 8,1 percent. Low accuracy of prediction for taking trips is due to small number of residents going on trips.

**Table 13 2 x 2 classification for tourism trip model**

Observation		Prediction		
		Categories		Correct percentage
		Not taking trips	Taking trips	
Categories	Not taking trips	2.567	45	98.3
	Taking trips	519	46	8.1
Overall percentage				82.2

Parameter estimation and partial test in logit binary model for working elderly are demonstrated in Table 13. Related to Age ( $X_1$ ) (with base category of age  $\leq 9$  years old), it can be stated that there is no difference in the probability of tourism trips generated by 10 – 19-year-old ( $X_{1,D1}$ ) residents with trips generated by  $\leq 9$  year-old residents. This is indicated by insignificant coefficients in the model. However, coefficients in age groups of 20 – 29 years old ( $X_{1,D2}$ ), of 30 – 39 years old ( $X_{1,D3}$ ) and 40 years old and above ( $X_{1,D4}$ ) are negatively significant. This suggests that residents

within those age groups have a lower probability to go on a trip than those in the age of  $\leq 9$ . From the odds ratios, age group of 20 – 29 has a probability of 0.299 times (lower) to go on a trip than group of 9 years old. The 30 – 39-year-old group has a probability of 0.260 times (lower) to go on a trip than group of 9 years old.

Factor of sex ( $X_2$ ) doesn't show any significant effect. In other words there is no difference in preference between men and women on travelling.

**Table 14 Parameter estimation for tourism trips model**

Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Odds ratio	Notes
X1			29,402	4	,000		Age
X1.D1	-,279	,199	1,965	1	,161	,756	10 - 19
X1.D2	-1,208	,275	19,315	1	,000	,299	20 -29
X1.D3	-,957	,317	9,144	1	,002	,384	30 – 39
X1.D4	-1,348	,312	18,617	1	,000	,260	40+
X2	,119	,130	,842	1	,359	1,127	Sex
X3			11,363	3	,010		Education
X3.D1	,536	,202	7,028	1	,008	1,710	Primary School
X3.D2	,466	,213	4,798	1	,028	1,594	Junior High School
X3.D3	,686	,206	11,093	1	,001	1,985	Senior High School and University
X4	,034	,257	,017	1	,895	1,034	Marital Status
X5			4,727	3	,193		Family Status
X5.D1	,322	,191	2,848	1	,091	1,380	Wife/Husband
X5.D2	,423	,281	2,262	1	,133	1,527	Children
X5.D3	,160	,294	,295	1	,587	1,173	Other household members
X6			177,458	10	,000		Regency / City
X6.D1	-,831	,290	8,185	1	,004	,436	Kerinci
X6.D2	-,564	,207	7,431	1	,006	,569	Merangin
X6.D3	-1,778	,301	34,868	1	,000	,169	Sarolangun
X6.D4	-,939	,213	19,448	1	,000	,391	Batanghari
X6.D5	,679	,223	9,253	1	,002	1,971	Muaro Jambi
X6.D6	-1,044	,243	18,397	1	,000	,352	Tanjatim
X6.D7	-,936	,239	15,321	1	,000	,392	Tanjabbar
X6.D8	-1,337	,261	26,296	1	,000	,263	Tebo
X6.D9	-1,342	,229	34,401	1	,000	,261	Bungo
X6.D10	-,383	,190	4,056	1	,044	,682	Sungai Penuh
X7	,003	,139	,000	1	,984	1,003	Rural - Urban
Constant	-,831	,348	5,702	1	,017	,435	

In its relation to education (elderly with no schooling/are primary school dropouts as the base category), it can be stated that there is a difference in probability of going on trips between primary school graduates ( $X_{3,D1}$ ) and those with no schooling or who are primary school dropouts. This is indicated by significant coefficients in the model. The same thing is seen also for higher educational levels.

Marital status ( $X_4$ ) does not show any significant effect. In other words, there is no difference in the probability of going on trips between those who are married and those who are not.

In contrast to marital status, family status, in particular, wife or husband shows significant effect/influence. Residents with a status as wife or husband have a probability of 1,380 times (higher) to go on a trip than the head of household. However, other family status does not show differences in probability.

As for regency/city factor (Jambi City as the base category), it can be argued that only residents of Muaro Jambi regency have higher probability of going on tourism trips in comparison with residents of Jambi City. In contrast, it has a lower probability for other regencies.

Furthermore, in the rural-urban context, the results of this study indicate that there is no difference in the probability between residents in urban areas going on tourism trips and those are in rural areas. This can be shown from the insignificance of  $X_7$ .

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Conclusions

1. In general, the number of tourism trips generated by Jambi residents is still relatively low. Only 14.14 percent (of the total population) has traveled within the last six months from enumeration of Susenas 2015.
2. Besides the low number of trips, tourism activities are still relatively limited. Only 17.79 percent of population go on a tourism trip.
3. Tourist attractions in Jambi Province itself is the most common tourism destination for Jambi residents, then followed by tourist attractions in South Sumatra, West Sumatra and Bengkulu as main destination.
4. Tourism trips generated by residents are mostly family trips, so it is relatively dominated by children and parents. In contrast, the number of residents in productive age (20 – 29 years old) going on a trip is relatively small.
5. Socio-economic factors that significantly influence residents to go on tourism trips are age, education, and status in family. In addition, there is a probability difference of tourism trips by residents of regency and of city in Jambi Province.

### Recommendations

1. Government needs to improve family attractions in Jambi Province given that Jambi residents are still oriented to family trips and prefer going to tourist attractions within the province.
2. This study suggests for further research by developing other variables in the model, especially variables at the family level, which have not been included in this study.

## REFERENCES

- Agustin, Sentosa S U, Aimon H. (2014). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi permintaan wisatawan domestik terhadap objek wisata bahari Pulau Cingkuak Kabupaten Pesisir Selatan. *Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi*, July, Vol. III No. 5, 2014; 1 – 20.
- Cohen, E. (1972). Towards a sociology of international tourism. *Social Research*, 39(1), 164-182.
- Damanik, Janianton dan Weber, Helmut. (2006). *Perencanaan ekowisata dari teori ke aplikasi*. Yogyakarta: PUSPAR UGM and Andi.
- Ernita. Y 2001. *Karakteristik pola perjalanan wisata di obyek-obyek Tawangmangu Kabupaten Karanganyar*. Bachelor's Thesis. Surakarta, Fakultas Geografi, UMS
- Fandeli, C. (1995). *Dasar-dasar manajemen kepariwisataan alam*. Yogyakarta: Liberty
- Foster, D. (1985). *Perjalanan dan manajemen pariwisata*. Mac.Milan
- Gamal, S. (1997). *Dasar-dasar pariwisata*. Edisi pertama. Cetakan pertama. Penerbit Andi. Yogyakarta.

- Hardiani,H; Junaidi,J. (2011). Analisis kuantitas dan kualitas penduduk sebagai orientasi pembangunan di Provinsi Jambi. Laporan Penelitian. Kerjasama BKKBN dengan PSK UNJA. Jakarta
- Irawan, K. (2010). Potensi objek wisata air terjun Serdang sebagai daya tarik wisata Di Kabupaten Labuhan Batu Utara. Paper works. Non-Degree Tourism Education Programs. Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Junaidi,J; Hardiani,H. (2009). Dasar-dasar teori ekonomi kependudukan. Jakarta. Hamada Prima
- Junaidi, J. (2015). Bentuk fungsional regresi linear (aplikasi model dengan Program SPSS). Jambi. Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis
- Marpaung, H.(2002). Pengantar pariwisata. Bandung :Alfabeta
- Mulyani, R. (2006). Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi kunjungan wisatawan ke kawasan wisata Pantai Carita Kabupaten Pandeglang. Bachelor's Thesis. Fakultas Pertanian. IPB
- Novitri, Q., Junaidi, J., & Safri, M. S. M. (2014). Determinan penerimaan daerah dari sektor pariwisata di kabupaten/kota Provinsi Jambi. *Jurnal Perspektif Pembiayaan dan Pembangunan Daerah*, 1(3), 149.
- Pendit.N S. (1994). Ilmu pariwisata sebuah pengantar. Perdana. Jakarta.
- Pitana, I Gde. 2005. Sosiologi pariwisata, kajian sosiologis terhadap struktur, sistem, dan dampak-dampak pariwisata. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset
- Sinclair, M. Theadan Mike Stabler. 1997. Economics of tourism. Routledge London
- Soekadijo, R.G, (2000), anatomi pariwisata: memahami pariwisata sebagai "system lingage", PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.
- Smith, Valene., (1977). Hosts and guests: the anthropology of tourism, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.
- Yoon, Y., Uysal, M. (2005).An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: a structural model. *Tourism Management*, 26(1), 45-56.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 10.Tahun 2009. tentang Kepariwisataaan.